

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

WILLIAM A. HIMCHAK, III,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:14-CV-1640
	:	
Plaintiff	:	(Chief Judge Conner)
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
KATHLEEN KANE, Attorney	:	
General of the Commonwealth of	:	
Pennsylvania, <i>et al.</i>,	:	
	:	
Defendants	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 30th day of September, 2014, upon consideration of the second motion (Doc. 14) for reconsideration filed by *pro se* plaintiff William A. Himchak (“Himchak”), wherein Himchak seeks reconsideration and *vacatur* of the court’s orders (Docs. 11-13) denying his motion (Doc. 10) for emergency injunctive relief and denying his first motion (Doc. 12) for reconsideration of said order, and the court twice having reviewed the record and found that Himchak’s request for injunctive relief is of no merit, and again admonishing that motions to reconsider are granted “sparingly,” Montanez v. York City, Civ. No. 12-CV-1530, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 96521, at *20 (M.D. Pa. July 16, 2014) (quoting Continental Casualty Co. v. Diversified Indus., Inc., 884 F. Supp. 937, 943 (E.D. Pa. 1995)), and that the court will not grant a motion for reconsideration based solely on the movant’s disagreement with a prior order of the court, see Boretsky v. Governor of N.J., 433 F. App’x 73, 78 (3d Cir. 2011) (quoting Wilchombe v. TeeVee Toons, Inc., 555 F.3d 949, 957 (11th Cir. 2007)), and the court concluding that Himchak’s instant filing again falls short of the

exacting standard of review applied to motions for reconsideration, it is hereby
ORDERED that Himchak's motion (Doc. 14) is DENIED.

/s/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
Chief Judge, Middle District of Pennsylvania